

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been added. Thus, Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Claim 1 now recites "said back frame is pivotally connected to said front frame." Claim 6 now recites "the lengths of said back frame and said front frame are different." Thus, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Seidner* (US 2,207,445). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 now recites "a stabilization frame located in proximity to said lower ends of said front and back frames, wherein said stabilization frame is constructed to provide stability for said fishing chair by fictionally engaged said stabilization frame with granular materials when said fishing chair is being placed on said granular materials." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed stabilization frame was disclosed by *Seidner* as shores 4 and/or bars 43. However, *Seidner* does not teach or suggest that shores 4 and/or bars 43 can provide stability for the platform ladder in Figure 1 by fictionally engaging shores 4 and/or bars 43 with granular materials on which the platform ladder is placed.

Claim 2 recites "said stabilization frame includes steps having a "┐" cross-section." As shown in Figure 3, the cross-sectional shape of *Seidner*'s rung plate 17 is in rectangular shape

instead of Γ -shaped, as recited. More importantly, since the Examiner had already characterized *Seidner*'s shores 4 and/or bars 43 as the claimed stabilization frame; thus, it is irrelevant as to what the cross-sectional shape of *Seidner*'s rung plate 17 is.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Seidner*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-10 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Dillon & Yudell Deposit Account No. 50-3083.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS